

REMARKS

Claims 3, 9, 11 and 23-46 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, and 12-22 cancelled, and new Claims 23-46 added. Claims 3, 9, and 11 have been allowed. The Applicants respectfully request examination of the application as presently amended. By the foregoing amendments, no new matter has been added.

The new claims define a transaction machine, and corresponding method, for completing bilateral transactions with remote parties using the value of coins deposited in a kiosk by a user. The new claims contain additional elements, as described below, that further distinguish the invention from the references cited by the Examiner. By providing a coin counting module with a network-connected computer running a user interface program, the present invention enables a user to interact with various remote parties over the communication network. The interaction is preferably accomplished using standard network communication protocols, thereby allowing a great variety of different types of transactions to be completed. Coin accepting cash transaction machines according to the prior art have not provided for two-way interactivity between the user and a remote recipient, and thus are much more limited in the types of transactions that may be completed. For example, using a machine according to the present invention, a user may purchase entertainment or travel tickets, and purchase merchandise from various network-connected vendors, using the value of coins and cash deposited into the machine. In contrast, prior art cash-accepting machines are limited to performing one-way (non-interactive) transactions.

In a final Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of the claims cancelled by this amendment under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), in view of various references. Of the references discussed by the Examiner in the Office Action, Molbak et al ('546) and Helbing in particular merit discussion with respect to the claims currently pending and not yet allowed. In brief, Molbak discloses a coin counting machine that allows a user to select between receiving a voucher or donating the coin value to a charity. A machine according to Molback simply records the user's selection and dispenses a receipt; it is not equipped to communicate with a remote recipient. Helbling discloses a method for

making charitable contributions, using machines in which currency may be inserted, which machines are in turn linked to a central station having links to one or more charitable organizations and/or a bank. Helbling discloses transferring information from the machines to the central station, and then periodically executing wire transfers to the connected charities based on the transmitted information. Helbling does not disclose a coin counting machine for accepting coins from donors.

Additionally, Helbling fails to disclose or suggest communication between any remote recipient (such as a charity) and any user of the machine (such as a charitable donor). Thus, Helbling, either alone, or in combination with any other reference, fails to disclose or suggest "a computer connected to a coin counting module . . . to execute program instructions . . . comprising . . . receiving a response back from the remote recipient via the communication link; providing the response received from the remote recipient to the user using said user interface; and confirming a transaction between the user and the remote recipient," as defined in Claim 23 (lines 17-21). In a nutshell, Helbling does not disclose or suggest bilateral communication between the user and the remote recipient. To the extent that Helbling discloses communication with a remote recipient, the communication does not include receiving a response from the remote recipient to the kiosk user (i.e., the communication is not bilateral).

Similarly, with respect to Claim 38, Helbling does not disclose or suggest a method including interactive capabilities, for example, the step of "providing the response received from the remote recipient to the user at the kiosk" (lines 15-16). Helbling discloses communicating with the "respective charities" only at "selected intervals" (col. 4 lines 5-15); thus Helbling teaches away from providing any response from a remote recipient to a user at a kiosk, because a user could not be inconvenienced by waiting at a kiosk for a "selected interval." All of the remaining new claims depend on either Claim 23 or Claim 38.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Molbak does not disclose transmitting data from a remote terminal to a host terminal, and thus the combination with Helbling is proposed. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement on page 5 of the Office Action that "[t]he motivation to combine Molbak et al '546 and Helbling is

the disclosure in Helbling that a communication link allows transfer of funds directly to charities." Molbak contains no teaching, motivation, or suggestion that transferring funds directly to charities would be desirable. Instead, Molbak teaches that "when the coins are removed from kiosk 100 the proper amounts can be deposited to the appropriate charity organizations" (col. 6, lines 46-48). That is, Molbak tacitly acknowledges that an operator of a machine according to Molbak would have no motivation to transfer funds directly to charities at any time before the deposited coins are actually removed from the machine and available for use by the operator. Similarly, Helbling suggests that currency should be accepted in increments of one dollar, for which no coin counter is required (col. 3, line 44).

Furthermore, even if Molbak and Helbling were combined, the present invention would not result. As discussed above, both Molbak and Helbling disclose a transaction machine or method for non-commercial transactions (donations to a charity), for which bilateral communication according to the present invention is not required. Thus, Molbak and Helbling, even in combination, fail to disclose or suggest bilateral communication between a kiosk user and a remote recipient according to the present invention. Bilateral communication is needed and/or desired for many types of remote transactions (for example, purchasing concert tickets). Prior art transaction machines for receiving and counting coins have not been provided with any remote communication capability, and much less so bilateral communication capability.

With respect to the new dependent claims in view of the other references cited by the Examiner, none of the references cited contain any teaching, suggestion, or motivation for any combination that includes bilateral, remote transactional capability as defined by Claims 23 and 38.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that all claims present in the application, including Claims 3, 9, 11 and 23-46, are in condition for allowance, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited.

The Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (213) 430-7424, if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of any issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: November 9, 2000

---

Brian M. Berliner  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 34,549

**O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**  
400 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899  
Telephone: (213) 430-6000